Americans against Liberty:

OR, AN

ESSAY

ON THE

NATURE AND PRINCIPLES

OF

TRUE FREEDOM,

Shewing that the Design and Conduct of the

AMERICANS

TEND ONLY TO

TYRANNY AND SLAVERY.

The THIRD EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.

Dictum est ab eruditissimis viris, nisi sapientem, liberum esse neminem. Quid est enim libertas? Potestas vivendi, ut velis. Quis igitur vivit, ut vult, nisi qui recta sequitur, qui gaudet officio, qui legibus paret. CIC.

——True liberty
——always with right Reason dwells
Twinn'd, and from her hath no dividual Being. MILTON.

Where there is no Law, there is no Freedom. LOCKE.

LONDON:

Printed for JAMES MATHEWS, No. 18, in the Strand. 1776.

[Price 3*d*. or ONE GUINEA per Hundred.]

Juſt Publiſhed, (Price Two Shillings.)

Maſſachuſettenſis :

OR, A

SERIES of LETTERS,

CONTAINING

A faithful State of many important and ſtriking Facts, which laid the Foundation of the *preſent Troubles* in the

Province of the *Maſſachuſetts - Bay* ;

INTERSPERSED WITH

Animadverſions and Reflections, originally addreſſed to the PEOPLE of that PROVINCE, and worthy the Conſideration of the TRUE PATRIOTS of this Country.

By a PERSON of HONOR on the SPOT.

BOSTON printed :

London reprinted for J. Mathews, No. 18, in the *Strand* ;

Alſo ſold by W. Harris, No. 70, *St. Paul's Church-Yard* ; George Allen, No. 59, *Pater-Noſter-Row* ; and by all the Bookſellers at the Royal Exchange.

AMERICANS

AGAINST

LIBERTY.

NO term, in the compaſs of language, is more liable to perverſion, or indeed has been more violently perverted, than the word LIBERTY. It conveys the idea of a moſt valuable bleſſing, rightly underſtood, and rightly applied. But the misfortune is, that, amidſt all the clamor reſpecting the name, the thing itſelf is frequently forgotten; and perhaps, in few caſes, has it been more entirely forgotten, than in the preſent uproar of the Americans.

When we inveſtigate the foundations of civil government, we muſt at firſt ſight perceive, that, in every ſocial compact, what is uſually ſtyled the natural liberty of man, or that liberty of action which is bounded ſolely by his own will, is neceſſarily reſtrained by particular *obligations*, common to every one included in the ſame compact. To the extent of this obligation, conſtituted and intended for the general benefit of the ſociety, every individual member is a *bondſman*. This compact is the *conſtitution* of the ſociety to which he belongs; this conſtitution fixes a boundary to his *natural liberty*; and he is

amenable to his ſociety for every tranſgreſſion of the common boundary.

Natural Liberty is ſo vague a term, that it is uſed to imply, ſometimes unlimited meaſures of freedom, and ſometimes almoſt none at all. The difficulty reſts upon the word *Nature*, and then upon the combination of that term; how it may be ſo uſed as to expreſs, with tolerable definition, the conception, which the mind has obtained, of the *liberty of nature*.

The nature of man (which is the preſent ſubject of inquiry) is to be conſidered, in reference to human polity, chiefly in its *moral* capacity. Government reſpects moral actions, and was ordained to direct them, or to puniſh the tranſgreſſion.

If we look at man as a moral creature; the wide diſtance we perceive him to ſtand from that rectitude and integrity, of which every mind is conſcious, leads us to conclude, that man, being (as it were) in a ſtate of war with himſelf and with all about him, is no leſs averſe, to the will and direction of others, than to the ſuggeſtions and accuſations of that internal principle of himſelf, which aims to preſcribe a ſtrait line for his crooked inclinations. This proves, that his nature is either radically *imperfect*, or now *wandered away* from its original rectitude. Leaving, however, that controverſy to divines; either of theſe will ſerve for our preſent purpoſe, which is to ſhew, that man's *natural liberty*, or the liberty of acting according to what he now finds in his nature, comprehends the faculty not only of doing *as much good as he wills*, but likewiſe the uncontrouled power of doing *as much evil as he can*. If it be ſaid, that to do evil is contrary to nature; I urge again, that evil, if there be ſuch thing as evil, is *in* his nature, and if he act according to the *whole* of what he finds within

within him (which he *naturally* muſt), he will act to the *commiſſion* of evil; nor can he act according to a *part* alone of what is within him, without a *violence* and *reſtraint* upon the reſt. Thus even to be what we uſually term a good man, who, according to the old moraliſts, has *conquered* himſelf; he muſt firſt declare war againſt his inbred *unruly* inclinations, and *bind* them down in ſubjection and ſervitude. He gives up a part of his natural liberty to the dominion of another part, which impoſes that rule of reſtraint, and which is certainly better than a wild diſcurſive freedom. So neceſſary therefore is government, in the firſt inſtance and in a caſe which will naturally be conſidered with every indulgence, that not a ſingle individual can live happy without it. The ſame rule holds in all well governed communities: the worſe ſubmits to the better in all things; and we never think, that reſtraint and puniſhment, on account of immoralities, are the leaſt incroachments upon the freedom of ſociety.

By the omiſſion of moral evil, when we talk of our nature, and our natural liberties, applying both of them to politics, many have been the miſtakes of the multitude and, by keeping it out of ſight, as many have been the ſubterfuges of the ſophiſter. Hence ariſes the ſucceſs, which the latter has at all times obtained over the former; and hence too have ſprung up, with a fungous and luxuriant growth, that ſeries of inflammatory libels and nefarious publications, which have waſted the manufacture of paper, and troubled the peace of the world.

Theſe principles of rectitude, or this conſciouſneſs of the worth of virtue, ſtill inherent in the nature of man, juſtify this force, which is put upon his liberty at large, or when it is directed to the purſuit of evil. It is a general rule; applicable to the conduct of *individuals*,

with reſpect to themſelves and the community to which they belong; and applicable alſo to *ſocieties*, with reſpect to their internal government, and to other ſocieties about them. No man is, or ought to be, in that abſolute kind of freedom, both for his own welfare and the welfare of other men, which hath not the rule and dominion of virtue. For as "abſolute power (over others) purifies "not men's blood, nor corrects the baſeneſs of human "nature;" ſo neither does abſolute freedom within a man's ſelf. The celebrated Mr. *Locke*, of whoſe wide notions of liberty nobody has any doubt, defining "the "ſtate of perfect freedom," tells us, that it is circumſcribed within "the bounds of the law of nature."* Now, if he mean, by this term, a *perfect*, *pure* and *upright* nature, there is certainly no difficulty or remiſſion in the propoſition. But, if taking this word *nature*, in a comprehenſive ſenſe, for *all* that we find in nature; we muſt include evil as well as good, for the original *boundaries* of which we muſt look farther than the wiſdom or power of man. It ſeems, therefore, ſcarce correct to talk of a *law of nature* which muſt be altogether *paſſive*, without adverting to ſome primary *agent*, who formed that nature, and impoſed a law upon it. There is a greater fallacy in the uſe of this term than perhaps may appear at firſt view; for when men ſpeak of a law of nature, they would have us to underſtand the law of a *perfect* nature; but when we come to examine this nature, for our inſtruction, we find it extremely *erroneous*, *depraved*, and *imperfect*, according to the loweſt and moſt lax conceptions of morality and virtue. Such a nature can never exhibit that perfect rule we require.—But if it be ſaid, that the nature of man is not here intended, but

* See his Second Book on Civil Government for this and other quotations which follow.

the

the *natura prima*, or nature of God; I aſk, where is this to be found? The nature of God, according to the ideas given us of him, is a perfect aſſemblage of perfect attributes. This cannot be under any law cognizable by us, unleſs finite beings can comprehend what is infinite.—If it be further ſaid, that by the law of nature is to be underſtood *the law*, which God has *given to nature*; this alſo will require ſome explanation. We muſt here divide nature into its two conſtituent parts, inert *matter* and active *ſpirit*; the one engaged by the objects of our *ſenſation* and the other what applies itſelf more particularly to our *intellection*. Of theſe two laſt [viz. *ſenſation* and *intellection*] the former more immediately relates to our external ſubſiſtence as animals; the latter diſtinguiſhes us as men. The law, which God hath given to both theſe properties of our nature, for their formation and ſupport, cannot be here meant; for *that* is a preſcription or line of his own will, on which we have either no faculties or no right to determine: and, therefore, if there be any law, deſigned for our comprehenſion by him, it muſt be a law, delivered from himſelf to us, and equal to the capacities of our own minds. It muſt be a law, reduced to the level of our apprehenſions, by which we are to conduct ourſelves, or direct others. We could have no certain ideas of rectitude or deviation but by his communication: And, hence, it is no wonder that ſome over ingenious people have diſputed the very exiſtence of evil, and rejected all morality and revelation together. We comprehend this law, call it of nature or of God (ſo it be not underſtood in a ſeparate view from him), only by this revelation; and by it alone are informed of the pleaſure, which God himſelf has in virtue and uprightneſs. The great philoſopher abovementioned

ſeems to have implied this ſtrictly, where, ſpeaking of this law of nature, he preſently refers us to the *written law* of GOD, and particularly cites this clauſe in it againſt *murder*, *Whoſo ſheddeth man's blood, by man ſhall his blood be ſhed.*

This ſort of reaſoning, though it may ſeem at firſt ſight more analogous to theology than to politics, will not be found impertinent to our ſubject, if we can eſtabliſh this principle, as one great pillar of all civil government, That human laws are to be arranged and enacted, agreeable to the law, revealed and divine*.

We ſhall find, purſuing our inquiries upon this ground, that the true freedom, allotted to man, is a freedom within bounds, and that theſe bounds are marked and preſcribed by his great Creator. Conſequently, his *natural liberty*, or the liberty of following the *depravities* of his nature, is curtailed by a poſitive injunction; the diſobedience of which is a rebellion againſt his Maker.

This power, which God has over all men, he has delegated, for ſocial good, to ſome men over others. *The powers that be* (ſays the law of which we are treating) *are ordained by him*; and indeed it muſt be ſo, unleſs any power that *is*, could have been formed either

* Of this opinion was the judicious *Hooker*, cited by *Locke*: Human laws are meaſures in reſpect of men, whoſe actions they muſt direct; howbeit ſuch meaſures they are, as have alſo their higher rules to be meaſured by, which rules are two, the Law of GOD, and the Law of Nature; ſo that laws human muſt be made according to the general laws of nature, and without contradiction to any poſitive law of Scripture, otherwiſe they are ill made." I inſiſt ſo much upon the rule given in the *divine* law; becauſe many of the American leaders have attempted to ſanctify their revolt by a ſpecious appearance of *religion*. My attempt has been to argue throughout *ad hominem*; and it will remain for the intelligent reader to judge, how far the Americans are to be juſtified upon any ſolid principles, *civil* or *religious*; and how much they really differ from ſome reſpectable perſons, who, miſtaking their deſign, have in the exceſs of candor ſupported their cauſe.

from

without or againſt his providence. Nor is there ſo much *toryiſm* in this principle, as at firſt ſight may appear. It meddles not with the queſtion, whether power originate from the King or the people: It ſimply ſays, the powers, that be or exiſt, have that exiſtence (be the mode whatever it may) by divine ordination. And all power, to whomſoever it be committed, is entruſted for the welfare and ſecurity, and I may add for the puniſhment and reſtraint, of thoſe, over whom it is eſtabliſhed.

It would lead me too wide from my ſubject in hand, ſhould I attempt an ample inveſtigation of that diſputed topic, the origin and right of civil government. I cannot, however, help obſerving by the way, that moſt of the ſyſtems or theories, which have fallen under my view, have paid too little attention to theſe capital points—the *providence* of God, and the *depravity* of man. For want of attention to theſe, their *poſtulata* have been crude, complex, or contradictory; and the deductions from them, many times wild or pernicious, and often impracticable. They loſe ſight of the Author of nature, and even nature itſelf. They forget the one, and miſrepreſent the other. They pourtray human nature like a "faultleſs "monſter," which the world cannot ſee; and in ſhort, repreſent her as unfit for law, becauſe, in their explanation, ſhe cannot need it.

The law of God was revealed, and the law of man, in agreement with that ſuperior law, was inſtituted, for the diſcountenance and ſuppreſſion of *one part* of man's natural liberty. So far as he obſerves theſe laws, he cannot, he muſt not, do *evil*. He is bound; he is obliged; he is a ſervant, or a ſubject, to the determination of other men, for a contrary conduct.

Is there, then, no *freedom?* If a reſtraint be put upon the actions, and even words, of every man in a ſtate, leſt

thoſe words and actions occaſion the unjuſt detriment of others, however they may profit himſelf; if he dare not gratify the corrupt inclinations of his own mind; and if he cannot live by a rule or liberty of his own; has he no liberty, no freedom, at all? Does he, by becoming a member of ſociety, become *ipſo facto* a ſlave?—Yes; in the ſenſe we have ſtated, he has not the leaſt liberty allowed him; but is compelled to obſerve and adhere to the dictates of other men—to men, who perhaps exiſted ages before him, and in whoſe deliberations he could have no voice —to men, who contrived for themſelves, and adapted the ſtanding modes and maxims of polity, all right perhaps, but all agreeable to their own ideas. In this ſenſe, even BRITONS are ſlaves, were born ſlaves, and muſt, unleſs they will commence ſavages, live and die ſlaves.

But there is a freedom, which no conſtitution, no law, no ſociety of men in the world, would or can abridge—a freedom, which conſtitutes the eſſence of the beſt polity, and, without a meaſure of which, not even the worſt can ſubſiſt. I mean the *better part* of man's liberty—the liberty of ſpeaking and doing what is *truly* beneficial to a man's perſon and property, which is always compatible with the good of ſociety as being a part of it; or, in other words, the liberty of doing what is *ſimply* and *morally right*. This moral rectitude of conduct is againſt no law, infringes no publick or private property, robs neither the weak nor the orphan, aims not to diſſolve the bonds of ſociety by hollow pretences or mean and inſidious arts, ſtrives to cultivate the general peace and proſperity, and is peaceable, eaſy and happy. 'Tis plain, that whatever reſtraints may be laid, whatever rules impoſed, or arrangements framed; this ſort of freedom cannot be the object, but muſt be conceived as out of the queſtion. There are few men of a vicious or reſtleſs tendency, who care to diſ-

pute

pute for this kind of freedom. Indeed, true liberty, like a modeſt virgin, ſhuns diſpute and brutal contention, chuſing rather to dwell with thoſe, who, without loud pretentions either to patriotiſm or virtue, have uſually therefore the moſt of both. The deſign, then, of all law, in one view of it, muſt be to confine and ſuppreſs evil; or the law would be of no uſe to ſociety: and if the intent of law be the demolition of miſchief; what man, who deſerves to live in ſociety, can but wiſh to ſee it in force?

'Tis evident, therefore, that the liberty of a ſociety, or that liberty by which the individuals of a ſociety are ſecure and proſperous, is liberty founded in *law*, liberty regulated by goodneſs, liberty purged from evil.

But all law implies *government*; as government itſelf, at leaſt good government, is a reciprocation of *law*. So that our propoſition is ſtill the ſame, when we ſay, that liberty reſts upon a government by law; a government proceeding upon common, determinate, and well-known principles; a government able alſo to enforce them. For a government without power is as poor a defence for liberty; as a government without law is a ſecurity for property. Law, government, and power, however paradoxical it may ſeem when the terms are ſeparately conſidered, are all, in the preſent caſe, the companions, the guards, and the ſupporters of liberty.

Thus, as it is a truth, that if man were not depraved, there need be no government to curtail his natural liberty; ſo is it equally a truth, that, being depraved, he could not enjoy his right liberty, in common with others, without government. In the *former* caſe, the reaſon of individuals, to ſay nothing of the other faculties, would be *perfect* reaſon, and, as ſuch, *uniform* and *univerſal* reaſon; and, conſequently, there could be no diſagreement

in

in their ideas, or in the practice of every human and ſocial virtue; becauſe *difference* in a faculty implies imperfection. In the *latter* ſituation, there are ſo many evils and infirmities, ſo many differences of opinion and practice, that, unleſs there were ſome rule of right eſtabliſhed and ſome authority for the ſuppreſſion of wrong, virtue would have but very little room and exerciſe in the world. The liberty of goodneſs would ſoon, very ſoon, be deſtroyed; at leaſt, it could not exiſt in *ſociety*. In this view we muſt all agree with Mr. *Locke*, that "law is not ſo much "the limitation, as the direction, of a [politically] free and "intelligent agent to his proper intereſt, and preſcribes "no further than for the *general* good of thoſe under "that law: could they be happier without it, the law, "as an uſeleſs thing, would of itſelf vaniſh; and that ill "deſerves the name of confinement, which hedges us in "only from bogs and precipices. So that, however it "may be miſtaken, the end of law is not to aboliſh or "reſtrain, but to preſerve and enlarge freedom. For "in all the ſtates of created beings capable of laws; "*where there is no law, there is no freedom.*" Nor, upon this head, can we differ much from that bold republican Mr. *Sidney*, where, after obſerving, that "the "weakneſs, in which we are born, renders us unable to "attain this good [juſt government] of ourſelves;" that "we want help in all things, eſpecially in the "greateſt, and that the fierce barbarity of a looſe multitude, bound by no law, and regulated by no diſcipline, is wholly repugnant to it;" he adds, "every "man, bearing in his own breaſt affections, paſſions, "and vices repugnant to this end, and no man owing "any ſubmiſſion to his neighbour; none will ſubject the "correction or reſtriction of themſelves to another, unleſs he alſo ſubmit to the ſame rule." And then comes

comes this remarkable expreſſion; "they [the common "people or multitude] are rough pieces of timber or "ſtone, which it is neceſſary to CLEAVE, SAW, or "CUT."—This, it may be owned, is the greateſt benefit, which the common people can expect to derive from a republic: they may be cleaven, ſawn and hewn to pieces by the arbitrary dictates of a hundred or two of inſolent, or deſpicable equals; or may be thrown together, like ſo many ſtones, by ſome architect of faction, in order to erect the ſuperſtructure of his own emolument, tyranny, or pride.

In oppoſition to theſe tenets, received hitherto by republicans themſelves, a wild ſpeculatiſt of that reſtleſs faction has inſtructed us, that "liberty is too imperfectly "defined, when it is ſaid to be a government by LAWS, "and not by MEN." I readily believe it, reſpecting the ſpecies of liberty, for which that writer contends. A government by known and poſitive *laws* is by no means calculated to ſerve the deſperate purpoſes of tumult and diſorder: A government by *men*, i. e. the mob, will ſuit ſuch deſigns infinitely better. Under ſuch a plan, "every "man may indeed be his own *legiſlator*;" and, though he diſturb the peace of all about him, he acts according to a law of his own; ſo that he is by no means amenable, to that "junto," who form the government of all States, becauſe ſuch a ſubjection would be an infringement of his *natural liberty*, an impeachment of his *ſelf-legiſlation*, and a virtual introduction of ſlavery.—Such crudities only blot paper: every man, with a grain of ſenſe and common honeſty, muſt ſee their utter impracticability in any ſtate upon earth. It would be charitable to call them *reveries*. To imagine a man in earneſt, who propoſes them, is to imagine him a foe both to the whole Britiſh empire and to the common intereſts of all mankind.

But

But here, probably, will ariſe the queſtion; Who ſhall delineate this road of ſocial liberty, and have authority to preſcribe boundaries to the wild excurſions of private will?

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

It may be anſwered, that where a ſet of people are left at large, without the exiſtence of any particular form of government among them, and where they concur, in conſequence, to eſtabliſh a civil polity, without which indeed no multitude could ſubſiſt together, without inconvenience, for three days; it ſeems reaſonable, that the *majority* of that people ſhould determine the form for the reſt. And whatever form be then eſtabliſhed, whoſe object, reſembling the moral government of an higher agent, is the general welfare, if Mr. *Locke*'s opinion may be taken, "the power, that every individual gave the ſo-" ciety when he entered into it, *can never* revert to the " *individuals* again, as long as the ſociety laſts; but " *will always remain in the community*; becauſe, with-" out this, there can be no community, no common " wealth."

But if a form be already eſtabliſhed in a country, either by the prior conſent of anceſtors, as is now the caſe with our own and moſt other countries in the world; or by the poſitive inſtitution of God, as in the theocratic ſtate of the Jews; no individual, no minority of individuals, no one branch itſelf (if there be more branches than one) of their legiſlature, has any right to introduce the leaſt alteration or innovation, in the one caſe; and, in the other, not the whole ſtate together. The former indeed may propoſe and recommend the correction of abuſes, if any ariſe: but the latter, having no flaws in their inſtitution, would find it their happineſs to obſerve it; as we may learn

learn by the Jews, who had this peculiar appointment, and only gained ſorrow by the change.

Indeed, there is no perſon, and perhaps, in ſtrictneſs of ſpeaking, there never was one, born OUT *of ſociety*; and, conſequently, as a member of community, every perſon muſt follow the rules of the general body. 'Tis an erroneous ſuggeſtion, in particular, often applied to Britiſh polity, that men of themſelves *enter into* or voluntarily conſtitute, from a herd at large, a ſocial compact. The truth is; *Britons* are born, in a particular view, under the dominion of their parents, and, in a general one, under the government of the *Britiſh* ſociety. The one obligation continues for a limited time: but the right of the ſociety is indefeaſable, and extends to all its members, ſo long as they abide in it.

When we talk of ſtates and communities, the notion of *individuals* is abſorbed: *their* rights and privileges are not merely their own, but the rights and privileges of the ſtate to which they belong. There is nothing ſo a man's own, in an enlarged political view, as to be abſtracted and independent of his community. His lands and property belong to him and are ſecured to him, not upon the foundation of what ſome miſtake for natural liberty, nor upon conſiderations of mere humanity and benevolence, but as a member of a community, endowed, by ſome conſtitution, with theſe advantages. Our nation would not think it proper to commence a war for a ſuffering Frenchman, or for a perſon unconnected with us or any ſociety (if ſuch a perſon could be found), however hard and affecting their caſes might be; but, if an Engliſhman ſuffer outrage, he claims the benefit of his community's power, and he has a right to find it. His lands and poſſeſſions, in the above ſenſe, are a part of the riches and poſſeſſions of the ſtate. Under the ſtate he holds them,

and

and by its laws. He cannot enjoy them but by the law; he cannot transfer them but by or according to law; he cannot increaſe them but by law. The law preſcribes his peculiar right and propriety, and takes that right away upon his diſobedience or rebellion. The law is the guardian of his peculiar property, and the rule of the whole community: it binds between the ſtate and individuals as a common condition; and ſo binds, that legal poſſeſſions are not to be forfeited to the public, or to the crown as its head, but by illegal actions and offences againſt the public, or the crown.

If we extend this reaſoning to ſubordinate bodies, which are neceſſarily appointed in all ſtates, ſuch as provinces, counties, towns, &c. they, in like manner, have nothing their own, *ſeparately* conſidered from the ſtate at large. They may have local advantages, and local laws; but as there can be but one conſtitution, any more than one ſoul in one individual body, in a well-ordered empire; there muſt be one general pervading authority, which includes all individuals and all property, ſo far as it extends. Their lands and territories belong not to them, in a diſtinct and ſeparate view, but to the empire itſelf. Elſe, why does the empire intereſt itſelf in their preſervation? Why does it reſtrain every invading foe, or collect its united force to puniſh thoſe who intrude? Not ſurely for the ſole benefit of a town or a province as ſuch, or becauſe injuſtice only may have been committed; but becauſe the empire conſiders it as much a part of itſelf, as a man eſteems a contuſion in his foot of ſome conſequence to the health and welfare of his whole body, and will by no means diſmember it, unleſs its rottenneſs or mortification endanger his frame. The whole ſtate is concerned for each individual member; and, as it protects each, has a right to demand the means of protection from

from each. To carry on our figure; when a man attacks or defends himſelf from an enemy; his whole force is collected; every nerve lends its vigor; and not the minuteſt part with-holds its proportion of aſſiſtance. It is the ſame in all ſtates or great bodies politic; or they either do not or cannot long deſerve the name.

Upon this ground, we may conclude with the celebrated *Monteſquieu*, who ſtates it for an aphoriſm, applicable to every form of civil polity, "that, in order to pre-"ſerve the principles of the eſtabliſhed government, *the* "STATE *muſt be ſupported in the* EXTENT *it has acquired*;" for otherwiſe it would grow unwieldy in itſelf, be more expoſed to foreign attacks, and be more diffuſed and of courſe more weak in its attempts to reſiſt them.

"But may not individuals diſlike the general government; and have they no remedy?"

If a man remain in a country, governed by any ſort of laws, his continuance there is a tacit conſent to the dominion of that country; and he is, therefore, obliged to conform to its laws. An Engliſhman in Spain has no right, from nature or reaſon, to inſult the government of that country, merely becauſe it is more arbitrary than his own. Let him diſpoſe of his property and quit the ſoil; but 'tis not his buſineſs to diſturb the peace of the ſociety. He may roam all over the earth; but, if he ſeat himſelf upon a civilized ſpot, he ought to conform to its inſtitutions, till he can prevail by fair means upon thoſe, who have a right to change them, to make an alteration to his mind.

"But what is to be done, in caſe of the innovation of arbitrary power in a free and mixed government?"

People ought to be very clear from perſonal or particular prejudices, when they mean to decide upon ſuch a caſe

caſe. It is an evil of ſuch alarming magnitude, that the wiſeſt, the richeſt, and the moſt able men in a nation are the moſt concerned to prevent it; and, without doubt, would be the quickeſt to perceive it. Such will not conſider the ignorant clamors of the multitude, nor be deluded by the artful inſinuations of the ſeditious. Facts, and facts alone, will determine their judgement. They will examine, where this arbitrary power reſides, upon whom it operates, and what evils are among its effects. They will both hear, *who* complain, and *of what* they complain: and, when their minds are convinced, will adopt no haſty, no illegal, no oppreſſive, or unconſtitutional meaſures. When men of this caſt, in any ſtate, are determined; it is upon ſuch *certain* grounds, that almoſt the whole ſtate will join them. This was remarkably the caſe at the time of the revolution. The firſt men in the nation, who had moſt at ſtake, were moſt alarmed; and the great body of the people ſoon followed them.

In our conſtitution, this arbitrary power muſt manifeſt itſelf either in the King, the Lords, or the Commons; and the two laſt are moſt deeply concerned to oppoſe it. If the King attempt to ſtretch his influence in the ſtate, it muſt be at the expence of the two Houſes, and to the diminution of their authority. This would hardly be borne by thoſe, who have ſo much influence to reduce it: and it never can be their intereſt to ſuſtain the innovation, while a ſentiment of honor, or a thought of ſecurity to perſon and fortune, are worth a moment's entertainment. On the other hand, it is hardly poſſible, that either or both of the Houſes ſhould effect an undue ſtride of influence, while the whole executive power (to ſay nothing of its negative voice) reſides in the Crown. If arbitrary power be charged upon the three branches in conjunction; it

ſhould

ſhould be recollected, that theſe branches compoſe our conſtitution, which in itſelf is and muſt be *abſolute* to the bounds of its dominion; though, ſo far from being *arbitrary*, it muſt annihilate its own foundations to become ſo. In ſuch an adventure, it would commit a *felo de ſe* upon itſelf; to ſay nothing of the immenſe hazard, to which the ſeveral members of the Legiſlature muſt be expoſed, in ſo vile an undertaking. They would moſt probably meet with, as well as deſerve, the reſentment of the people. Arbitrary power is a gaudy delicate plant, which thrives beſt in the warmeſt climates: we have too many thorns and nettles to admit the cultivation of ſuch an exotic in the regions of *Britain*.

Our Repreſentatives muſt be enſlaved themſelves, ere they can enſlave us. And can it be the object of men of fortune (and ſuch are the far greater majority of both Houſes), for the ſake of a little dirty bribe, if it even were propoſed, to ſacrifice their honor, their freedom, the freedom of their poſterity, the ſecurity of their fortunes, and all this at the peril of their lives? Is there no virtue, no ſenſe, but in ſome declaiming patriots, who are known to have neither fortune nor credit?

——— *Credat Judæus Apella,*
Non ego.

If we are aggrieved by any laws unadviſedly made; if we are oppreſſed by any regulations of a pernicious tendency; it is the intereſt of no men in the community to relieve us more than of thoſe, who compoſe our conſtitution. They ſtand upon the *general* bottom; and, if they deſtroy that, they deſtroy themſelves. They owe all their influence and dignity to the proſperity of the empire; and, above all things, muſt be zealous for its preſervation.

Beſides,

Beſides, the conſtitution is lodged in too many hands for the power of a few to deſtroy it. The throne would be convulſed as well as the country, and hath always ſuffered in its influence by the raiſing a general ſtorm. This is the language of reaſon and common ſenſe; and, I ſhould ſuppoſe, it may be underſtood a little in Weſtminſter, and poſſibly too by that ever-opprobrious race of men, who manage the helm of affairs.

The King, Lords, and Commons, as I ſaid before, compoſe the conſtitution, and ſupreme legiſlature, of the Britiſh empire. I am warranted in this aſſertion by great authorities, which it is at preſent foreign to my ſubject to quote, as well as by the reaſon of things. Now there cannot be, in a proper arrangement of polity, two or more diſtinct legiſlatures of equal authority. It will not anſwer in mere ſpeculation. Nor is there in our own. Our conſtitution never knew any thing of legiſlation equal to or independent of itſelf within its dominion; our law-books have no terms expreſſive of a diſtinct authority, and, could any thing of that ſort be admitted, our conſtitution, ſo long the admiration of the world, would fall into ruins; nor, in the event, could our kingdom ſtand. Every member of our empire is born under this controul, muſt live ſubject to it while he is a member, and is protected by it as ſuch; whether he reſide in Europe, Aſia, Africa, or America.

Britiſh freedom then is a freedom of law, a conſtitutional freedom, a freedom of acting and ſpeaking what is right, a freedom founded in reaſon, happineſs, and ſecurity. All licentious freedom, called by whatever ſpecious name, is a ſavage principle of ſpeaking and doing what a depraved individual thinks fit, without regard to the convenience of others, or the welfare of the world.

The

The former is undeniably a ſubſtantial good: the latter is indiſputably the greateſt curſe, that could be eſtabliſhed for mankind.

We may now aſk; For which of theſe two is the preſent conteſt and contemplation of the *Americans?*

It cannot be for the *firſt*; for they have enjoyed, ever ſince they could be called a people, all the advantages and immunities of *Britons*. Not the neareſt ſubjects to the throne in *England*, nor the remoteſt members of the ſtate in *Aſia*, have had a wider field of freedom to range in, than the once happy ſons of highly-favored and indulged *America*. Can it be then for the *laſt* of theſe? Is it poſſible? The great majority of the empire, as well as the government and conſtitution of it, are againſt them in this claim, and againſt them for their own, as well as the general, welfare. It is not *their* intereſt to poſſeſs ſuch a freedom: It is *our* duty to prevent it.

The matter then (as we ſhall find) will come to this iſſue; that the rebel-*Americans*, in the wildeſt deluſion and by the worſt of means, are avowing themſelves THE OPEN ENEMIES TO THE PUBLIC AND GENERAL LIBERTY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

This may appear a ſtrong propoſition; but a little further conſideration may evince it true. I give them, or rather the uninformed bulk of them, credit, that they mean not at preſent to carry matters to this enormous length; but, while I am happy in making every conceſſion in their favor, conſiſtent with truth, I muſt add, that they have been ſeduced, impoſed upon, and betrayed.

They have been *ſeduced* by diſhoneſt and deſigning men. Some, wiſhing to cancel their debts to Britain, have imagined that, by the confuſion of affairs, all claims upon them may be buried in the ruins. Others, having little to loſe and much to hope for, are for commencing poli-

tical

tical architects, and would upon theſe ſad ruins erect a fabric of their own. Thus between roguery and ambition, poor *John Bull* is to be turned out of his houſe!

They have been *impoſed upon* by inflammatory publications, both at home and abroad, while the truth, and eſpecially of late, is denied an acceſs, and *ex parte* hiſtories alone have received a briſk circulation. Miſinformed and miſtaken men have ſuggeſted their prejudices, and operated upon an irritable and paſſionate temper, to a ſurprizing degree of romance and enthuſiaſm. Factious and republican incendiaries have alſo, with a malignant induſtry, circulated a thouſand ſcurrilities and falſehoods, while the head has been too hot to examine, and the judgement too biaſſed to compare.

They are *betrayed* into a civil war, upon very unequal terms, with a ſtate, which wiſhes them no evil, and whoſe very intereſt it is to do them none;—with a ſtate, which would receive them with open arms, upon the ground of honor, law, and reciprocal communication.

Thus the enemies to Britiſh and conſtitutional liberty, by diſhoneſty, falſhood, and ambition, have engaged the great bulk of the Americans to adopt their own views, and, by a ſeries of artifices, to ſupport intereſts, which will deſtroy them. Could they ſucceed in their violence, it were eaſy to point out the path of their ruin both from themſelves and from others; but if they ſhould not, as indeed they cannot, how can they expect in future that complaiſant indulgence to their intereſts from Great Britain, which ſhe has often given in preference to her own?

I am, however, more directly to ſhew, how the *Americans* (the greater part, as I ſaid before, through much ignorance and ſimplicity), in their preſent hoſtile aims, *are militating againſt* THE PUBLIC LIBERTIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. Their

Their conduct falls under this deſcription, as it reſpects;

1. Their refuſal of ſubjection to the Britiſh legiſlature:

2. Their demolition of the provincial legiſlatures: And

3. Their attempt to eſtabliſh republicaniſm.

The two firſt are, in fact, comprized, in the third; but we will proceed in this analyſis *argumenti gratiâ*, and for a clearer detection of their proceedings.

1. The oppugnation made to the ſupreme legiſlation of Great Britain.

The conſtitution of Great Britain is the palladium of Britiſh liberty throughout the empire. This conſtitution (as we have obſerved) conſiſts, and has for ages conſiſted, of King, Lords, and Commons, in whom, collectively, the ſupremacy of power is lodged over the whole, for the good of the whole. Before the exiſtence of her preſent Colonies, every member of the ſtate was underſtood to be under this *ſupreme* power of the ſtate; and when their exiſtance began, they were conſidered as ſo many branches ſpringing from the original ſtock, and receiving their life, their ſupport, and their all from it. They were without the means of defence, and accordingly looked up for it to their indulgent parent; nor ever looked in vain. They received, for their conduct, laws and regulations made in England, and were allowed to make local and municipal decrees for themſelves, ſubject however to the controul of England, and *not repugnant* to her general and *ſtatute* laws. This plainly implies their entire ſubordination and ſubjection to thoſe ſtatute laws, and conſequently to the power that enacts them. In caſe of diſobedience, they were to be "put out of the King's allegiance and "protection." They were ever conſidered, and ever expreſſed, under the title, and upon the footing, of "natural born ſubjects;" which would have been an abſurdity,

abſurdity, but upon the idea of their being *equally* ſubject to the ſupreme, controuling power of the King and Parliament. Upon this ground ſtood, and now ſtand, the liberties of America; and upon the ſame ground ſtand the liberties of Great Britain. They are interwoven by one conſtitution. American liberties are not to twine like ivy round the Britiſh oak, feed upon its ſap, and impoveriſh the ſtock; but muſt grow together with it, and form the luxuriant branches of one ſpreading tree.

There is no liberty to be thought of among Britons, but this conſtitutional liberty: and the ſtronger and more diffuſive the influence of the conſtitution, the more ſecure and flouriſhing are the liberties it defends. To ſay, that the Britiſh conſtitution may become the patroneſs of tyranny, is to aſſert, what not only is contrary to all fact and experience, but what is directly oppoſite to common ſenſe. The King, Lords and Commons of Great Britain, cannot adopt what truly deſerves the name of tyranny, without every hazard and inconvenience to themſelves. The KING muſt be made the dupe and drudge of his Parliament, expoſed, as the great executor of the law, to do the diſhonorable and dirty work of abuſing his people; and muſt be given up to the dangers of a diſputed authority and a tottering throne. The LORDS muſt not only forget all dignity of character but intereſt of fortune, whenever they combine in the project of univerſal ſlavery. Their poſterity and property (no inconſiderable ſtake for their conduct!) would, on the one hand, become expoſed to a ſordid dependence on an abſolute monarch; or, on the other, be reduced in the privileges of rank, and ſink into the common ſewer of a democracy. Nor would the COMMONS be at all advantaged by the concurrence in an arbitrary ſway, which,

with

with reſpect to their own perſons, muſt be temporary and precarious at the beſt. They too have fortunes, character, and families to enjoy. All may be loſt, none would be ſecure, by a deſpotiſm of any kind. The ſufferings of each member may be great and total: his inſecure dominion of a day would at moſt be divided, and therefore ſmall and partial. They cannot enſlave without being enſlaved themſelves; even though we ſhould give no credit to their honor and generoſity.

"But can they enſlave *America?*" I anſwer; ſlavery is no part of our conſtitution. We have no idea of it in our law. It is not to be found in our country. Negroes here, wherever they have been ſlaves before, experience ſomething like *natural rights*, and are emancipated in a moment by ſetting foot upon our liberating ſhores. We, as a community, exerciſe no cruelties; nor is any individual ſuffered to exerciſe them. We hang even Americans themſelves if they murder thoſe, whom they make ſlaves, when brought to the determination of our laws.* The Britiſh government never tolerated oppreſſion; but has interpoſed its power, in numberleſs inſtances, for helpleſs foreigners to reſcue even them from oppreſſion. It never tyrannized over *Britain*: It always cheriſhed and ſupported *America*.

"But is not taxation, without conſent, tyranny?"—The propoſitions of the Houſe of Commons in February (1775) have abſolutely annihilated that controverſy. It is true, Great Britain cannot give up her right of demanding, from every part of the empire, the proportionate ſervice and burden of each for the common defence; yet the offer, held out to America, of adjuſting the mode of raiſing that ſhare, gives an entire new turn to the queſ-

* Witneſs Captain *Ferguſon* of Virginia, who now hangs in chains near Blackwall, for the murder of his Negro Boy upon the high ſeas.

tion. So that it is no longer, whether the King and parliament by the officers of the crown ſhall raiſe a revenue in the colonies; but, whether the colonies are not bound, upon every principle of reaſon, juſtice, and duty, to conribute to the ſupport of the general burden in common with the ſubjects of Britain, who have heretofore been taxed million upon million for them. Nor are they expected to pay it into the royal coffers as a civil liſt ſubſcription; but into a public ſtock, ſubject to parliamentary controul, for their own defence. But they have rejected this peaceful plan, and notoriouſly upon a ſyſtem, inimical to the ſupremacy of Great Britain, their beſt and their only protector. 'Tis true, before their project was ripe enough to be owned, *ſome* of them, and the *Penſylvanians* in particular, did talk of "ſettling a revenue, "from a ſenſe of duty to their Sovereign, and of eſteem "for their mother-country:"* But 'tis equally true, that they never have taken one ſtep to put this ſenſe of duty into exerciſe. They reprobated the propoſition of Britain; but have never exhibited another in its ſtead. Their laſt addreſs to the throne does not ſo much as glance at any ſuch thing; but talks of *their* rights and *their* expectations, as though the *mother country* had none.

Admitting however for a moment, that ſuch expectations of debilitating the great authority of the conſtitution ſhould ſucceed; what would be the conſequence? Theſe members, I mean the legiſlative members or branches, diſtinct and independent of the original body, would grow, perhaps luxuriantly for a while; but, in the end, would be unwieldly in themſelves, inſupportable to each other, and ungovernable by the head. Having no general controul, they would be a vaſt aſſemblage of petty ſtates, ever quarrelling amongſt themſelves, weak to reſiſt,

‡ *Penſylvanian inſtructions in* Dickinſon's *Eſſay*, P. 19.

and

and always expoſed to a foreign invaſion*. That this is no conjecture, paſt experience has ſhewn. It was ſcarce two years ago, when the Virginians and Penſylvanians were upon the point of drawing the ſword upon each other in a diſpute of their reſpective boundaries. And, perhaps, but for the quarrel excited againſt the mother-country, the New Yorkiſts, the Penſylvanians, and people of Connecticut, would all have been thus engaged, at this very time, upon the ſame account. They are confeſſedly as jealous, Province by Province throughout the continent, of the advantages and commerce of their ſeveral neighbours, as the Dutch can be of the Engliſh, or of any other commercial power. Excluſive of all other Conſiderations but *theſe*, it would be their wiſdom, as it is their intereſt, to maintain the ſupremacy of Great Britain, whoſe power alone can protect them from the depredations of a foreign ſtate, and (what is of equal conſequence) preſerve them from anarchy and bloodſhed among themſelves.

Thus it appears to be their advantage, as well as duty, their happineſs as well as their freedom, to preſerve the conſtitution of Britain inviolate, ſupreme, and abſolute over all her dominions. I would not mean by *abſolute* authority an *arbitrary* power, for theſe are widely different; but that unlimited ability of providing for the welfare of the whole empire, which is not to be impeded by the frowardneſs or obſtinacy of any of its parts. This au-

* "What *muſt be* the conſequence (ſays an able American writer) "of a rebellious war with the mother-country, any perſon of com-"mon ſenſe, if he will take the liberty to exerciſe it, may eaſily "foreſee. Even a final victory would effectually ruin us [the Ame-"ricans]; as it would *neceſſarily* introduce civil wars among our-"ſelves, and leave us open and expoſed to the avarice and ambition "of every maritime power in Europe or America. And till one "part of this country [America] ſhould have ſubdued the other, and "conquered a conſiderable part of the world beſides; this peaceful "region muſt become, and continue to be, a theatre of inconceivable "miſery and horror."

 thority

thority is veſted in her for the good of the whole; and thoſe, who direct the helm, are reponſible to the whole for the exerciſe of that authority. As tyranny, or the abuſe of this public authority for private ends which oppoſe the general good, would be oppoſite to the law of God and nature: ſo the uncontrouled liberty of depraved and licentious individuals is equally ſo. I am warranted in this reaſoning by Mr. *Locke* himſelf, whom the Americans have appointed their political apoſtle, and who aſſerts, that the "freedom of men under government, is "to have a ſtanding rule to live by, COMMON TO EVERY "ONE of that ſociety (meaning a commonwealth, empire, "or community) and made by the *legiſlative power* "(which he ſays, in another place, is the *ſupreme power*) "erected in it." And he further tells us, that, "when "any number of men have conſented to make *one* com-"munity or government (which conſent, he ſays, is im-"plied when any one holds *poſſeſſions or hath enjoyment of* "*any part of the dominions of any government*) they are "thereby incorporated and make ONE BODY *politic*, "wherein the MAJORITY have a right TO ACT and "CONCLUDE the reſt:" for, were it otherwiſe, as he preſently obſerves, "the *variety of opinions* and *contra-*"*riety of intereſt*, which unavoidably happen in all col-"lections of men; would render the coming into ſo-"ciety upon ſuch terms only like *Cato*'s coming into the "theatre, only to go out.—Where the majority cannot "conclude the reſt, *there they cannot act as* ONE BODY, "and *conſequently* will be immediately diſſolved." Now it is not to be doubted, but that the *mojority* of ſubjects in the Britiſh empire are wholly againſt the independent legiſlation and abſolute claims of the American; for this has been proved, in the only fair way a controverſy of the kind can be proved, by the collected wiſdom and ſenſe of the

the nation in their repreſentatives. Many of the greateſt traders themſelves, who are moſt intereſted of any men to preſerve peace and quietneſs, are ſo convinced of the abſolute neceſſity of ſtopping this licentious claim of America, that they have declared a reſolution of venturing no more goods into that country upon the ſlender ſecurity of provincial honor, and that they had rather ſuffer by a temporary ſuſpenſion of commerce, than commit their property to perſons, who are and would be out of the reach of the Britiſh laws. People may ſophiſticate as they pleaſe, but nothing can be more obvious than this ſimple truth; that where there is not a rule or law equally binding upon every member of a ſtate, ſuch ſtate can neither act with efficacy, nor remain in ſecurity. It muſt be full of diſcord in itſelf, and, of courſe, will be an eaſy conqueſt to others.

2. BUT the Americans ſeem at preſent ſo extremely prejudiced againſt every thing that bears the reſemblance of the Britiſh conſtitution, that they have ſwept away thoſe analogies or epitomes of it among them in their Colony legiſlatures, and thereby cancelled their obedience to (what they never yet had the boldneſs to deny to be) the conſtitutional authority of their own provinces. Governor, council and aſſembly, the ſubordinate guardians of their conſtitutional liberty, are now no more. Their plot is fancied ripe enough to enable them to throw off the maſk. While it was in embryo, the ſounding name of a Provincial parliament was a convenient fallacy. It flattered the natural vanity of an American, otherwiſe well-diſpoſed, without offending his loyalty; and it was a favorable ſtep to thoſe, who had further views, but had not yet the confidence to ſpeak them out. Thus urged though by many different motives, the Provincials could be

ſatisfied with nothing but a *parity* of power with the parent-ſtate, talked high of their own importance and dignity, and fancied, at length, that the very opulence and commerce of Britain was entirely ſupported by themſelves. Some ingenious folks at home have contributed to ſwell this American bladder. Hence they have been called in the higheſt ſtyle of bombaſt, "the ſole baſis of our em-" pire;" and it has been ſaid, that her oppoſition will give Great Britain "a wound, which no time can heal," and that the laſt reſource of the mother country will be, " to have a philoſophical ſenſe of dignity ſtep in under the " ſhape of conſolation." Alas, poor Britain!

Well; they have acompliſhed one purpoſe, and have made one very conſiderable advance in ſupport of their favorite idea. They have now nothing *conſtitutional* ſtanding in their way in America; ſo that, thus far at leaſt, they have weakened the general bulwark, and the true liberty annexed to it, of the whole empire. They may triumph over the venerable ruin, and, with a fanatic ardor, exult; *Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen.* They have expunged, as far as poſſible, every appearance of Britiſh liberty from among them: Britons are no longer ſafe in thoſe revolted regions; and their properties, confided to provincial honor, have been entruſted, it appears, upon a troubled ſea, which caſteth up mire and dirt.

Mire and *Dirt*—in the one, the worth of Britiſh manufactures is ſtuck faſt and probably ſunk; with the other the proprietors, and even their own beſt friends at home, are beſpattered and abuſed.

The Noble Peer, whoſe miniſterial talents were attended with ſo much applauſe and ſucceſs in the conduct of the laſt war, and who has been ever ready to patronize the cauſe of the Colonies, ſo far as is conſiſtent with their ſubordi-

ſubordination to Britain, did not, and could not, patronize what is now become "the good old cauſe" ſufficiently for their independent views and inclinations. They have embraced his aſſiſtance as far as it went; and when his Lordſhip would ſtep no farther, they left him behind, with ſuch marks of ungrateful reſentment, as would offend a mind, leſs ſuſceptible of the mortifications of contempt and deſertion, than his Lordſhips's is conceived to be. The Noble Lord was too much a friend to the Navigation Act, and the other acts which ſupport it, to be the friend of a commerce, which would rival Britain in many inſtances, and advantage her in none. His Lordſhip conſidered it as "the legal, conſtitutional, and HITHERTO "unqueſtioned prerogative of the crown, to ſend any part "of the Britiſh army to any of the Britiſh dominions and "poſſeſſions, whether in America, or elſewhere, as His "Majeſty, in the due care of his ſubjects, may think ne-"ceſſary for the ſecurity and protection of the ſame;" and "that this prerogative cannot be rendered dependent "upon the conſent of a Provincial aſſembly in the Colo-"nies, without a moſt dangerous INNOVATION and de-"rogation from the dignity of the imperial crown of "Great Britain." This did not ſquare with their notion of permitting or not permitting theſe Britiſh troops to appear in territories, which they call their own; the arrival of whom, without their conſent, firſt had and obtained, they termed, and long before their commencement of open war, "an hoſtile and unjuſtifiable "invaſion." This is their reſolution, the reſolution of the combined wit and wiſdom of America, "That the "keeping a ſtanding army in the Colonies, in times of "peace, *without the conſent of the legiſlature of that Co-"lony* in which ſuch army is kept, is againſt law:" i. e.

againſt *their* law; for no law of the conſtitution, common or ſtatute, ſays any ſuch thing. His "Lordſhip alſo "conceived, that they would give a JUST and free aid "in ſuch honorable proportion, as may ſeem meet and "becoming from great and flouriſhing Colonies towards "a parent-country, labouring under the heavieſt burdens, "which *in no inconſiderable part* have been willingly taken "upon ourſelves and poſterity, for the DEFENCE, EX-"TENSION and PROSPERITY of the COLONIES." No, ſaid the Colonies, when this propoſition "made its "way to the remoteſt wilds of America;" no power on earth has a right to take our money from us without our conſent: we do not conſent to this propoſition, but think it more inſidious than that of the Parliament: *Ergo*, you have no right to expect any ſuch matter from us. Thus a gracious œconomy furniſhes them with any argument, and every argument, for leaving their parent-country, labouring under the heavieſt burdens, taken upon her, and her children, and her children's children, for American defence, extenſion and proſperity.—And thus the Americans have deſerted his Lordſhip, and, according to his idea, the conſtitution together.

Conduct like this might well wring a complaint from another of their Noble friends, whoſe learning and abilities are indeed an honor to his profeſſion, ſimilar to that upon another occaſion; when he is reported to have ſaid, "I proteſt, I am afflicted with grief, when I reflect on "their proceedings; in ſuch an arduous moment, that "ſuch a plan, the labor of ſuch talents and ſuch experi-"ence ſhould be rejected, even from their conſideration "with ſuch indecent indignity!*"

Which of their friends have not they ſlighted and abu-

* Parliamentary Regiſter, Lords' Debates, page 88.

ſed?

ſed? Upon whom have not they ſcattered their opprobrious dirt? Another Noble Lord, high, and deſervedly high, in his country's honors and eſteem, who led the adminiſtration that concurred in, and who himſelf adviſed and promoted, what is now called "The Declaratory "Act;" has not eſcaped a ſample of their indiſcriminate vengeance. His Lordſhip has been heard to "expreſs "pretty ſtrongly," what every lover of his country muſt concur in, "his adherence to his old opinion of the pro-"priety of the declaratory act, which he ſeemed to con-"ſider as NECESSARY TO THE DOMINION OF THIS "COUNTRY, and NO WAY HURTFUL TO THE FREE-"DOM OF AMERICA."* But the Americans have claſſed this very act, and marked it with capitals for particular obſervation, amongſt thoſe, of which they ſay, that their "immediate tendency is to ſubvert the right of "their having a ſhare in legiſlation, by rendering aſſem-"blies uſeleſs;—and that they form a regular ſyſtem of "ſubjugating the Colonies."† Whoever looks into the proceedings of their Congreſs, will find, that no one act has been more ſeverely animadverted upon, or hung up higher for popular deteſtation, than this very law, which their much-abuſed friends, who promoted it, have uniformly conſidered as indiſpenſably neceſſary to the welfare and dominion of this country. They have ſtigmatized it as "unconſtitutional and the ſource of theſe unhap-"py differences;" ‡ and aſſert, that "the wit of man "cannot poſſibly form a more clear, conciſe and compre-"henſive definition and SENTENCE OF SLAVERY, than "the expreſſions" which this act contains.‡ And all amounts to the formidable charge upon his Lordſhip and friends, who in great charity ſtept forth to relieve their in-

* Parliamentary Regiſter, Lords Debates, p. 16.
† Letter of Congreſs to the Colonies in 1774.
‡ Penſylv. Reſ. V.
‖ Inſtruct. to Penſylv. Members.

digent cauſe, of combining, or at leaſt ſharing in the attempt, with the preſent "wicked and abandoned admini-
"ſtration," to enſlave them. Probably the reaſon of this apparent ingratitude, or (as themſelves term it) American virtue, is, that they have ſuch a number of redoubtable heroes of their own to vend their ſtock of panegyric upon, as to render it impoſſible to ſpare any for exportation; ſo that the whole "torrent of panegyriſts," being confined to one channel, "may roll down their re-
"putations to that lateſt period, when the ſtreams of
"time ſhall be abſorbed in the abyſs of eternity."*

By deſtroying the ſyſtem of government eſtabliſhed by Great Britain among them, and annihilating the powers of the governors, councils and aſſemblies, in their ſeveral Provinces; they likewiſe diametrically contravene the judgment of the great Mr. *Locke*, their profeſſed director. He tells us, that "the LEGISLATIVE is not only the SU-
"PREME *power* of the common-wealth (by which term
"he every where means the *community* under any form
"of government), but is *ſacred* and *unalterable* in the
"hands, where the community have *once* placed it;—nor
"can any oaths to any foreign power whatſoever, or ANY
"DOMESTIC SUBORDINATE POWER, *diſcharge any*
"*member of the ſociety from his obedience to the legiſlative*,
"acting purſuant to their truſt; nor oblige him to any
"obedience, contrary to the laws ſo enacted, or farther
"than they do allow; it being *ridiculous* to imagine, one
"can be tied ultimately to obey ANY power in the ſo-
"ciety, which is not the SUPREME." And again he ſays, "In a conſtituted common-wealth, ſtanding upon
"its own baſis, and acting according to its own nature,
"that is, acting *for the preſervation* of the community
"[i. e. by keeping it entire], there can be but ONE
"SUPREME POWER, which is the LEGISLATIVE, to

* *Suffolk* Reſolves, patronized by the Congreſs in 1774, ſaid to be drawn up by Dr. Cooper of Boſton.

"[i. e.

" which ALL THE REST *are and muſt be ſubordinate.*" Mr. *Locke* alſo quotes the judicious *Hooker*, as concurring in the ſame ſentiment. "The *public power* of all ſociety " is above *every ſoul contained in the ſame ſociety*; and the " principle uſe of that power is, *to give laws to all that* " *are under it*, which laws, in ſuch caſes, we muſt obey, " unleſs there be reaſon ſhewed, which may *neceſſarily* " enforce, that the law of reaſon, or of God, doth en- " join the contrary." This joint opinion evidently implies theſe three propoſitions:

1. That there is, and can be, but one ſupreme power in a well ordered ſtate.

2. That this ſupreme power is the legiſlative power, which hath a right to make laws binding upon the whole, for the good of the whole.

3. That no ſubordinate power, whether foreign or domeſtic, can releaſe any members of the ſociety from this indefeaſable obligation.

Applying theſe propoſitions to the caſe before us, we may obſerve, that the King and Parliament is the one ſupreme power of the Britiſh Empire; unleſs the empire be thrown into the political confuſion of *imperium in imperio*, and can admit the misfortune, as well as the error, of different and claſhing authorities: that this power of King and Parliament, being the only ſupreme power known in the Britiſh conſtitution, is the legiſlative power, which hath a right to bind the whole and every part of the Britiſh Empire, for the general welfare: and that no provincial or municipal power, much leſs extra-provincial and congreſſional powers, unknown and repugnant to all law and order, can acquit any ſubjects from their loyalty and duty, or ſanctify any acts of treaſon and rebellion committed by them.

In oppoſition to all this, the Colonies do publiſh, aſſert and declare, that " they are entitled (but they have " not quoted the ſtatute which entititles them) to a

" free

" free and EXCLUSIVE POWER OF LEGISLATION " *in their* SEVERAL *provincial legiſlatures*;" though they muſt recollect, or all the world will do it for them, that the Colonies never enjoyed, and cannot, *as Colonies*, enjoy any ſuch privilege or emancipation. What a *Hydra*, were it poſſible to realize the idea, and reduce it to practice! We ſhould crumble into ſo many petty diſtinct ſtates, without any one coercive and directing power to collect the ſtrength of the ſeveral parts, and muſt fall therefore an eaſy prey to the ſeveral parts, and muſt fall therefore an eaſy prey to the firſt ſworn enemy of our liberties and country. We ſhould ſoon forfeit that happy ſingularity, which the Americans themſelves allow us, when they declare, that " Great Britain, and " her dominions *excepted*, there is ſcarce a ſpot on the " globe inhabited by civilized nations, where the veſ- " tiges of freedom are to be obſerved."*

BUT " the Americans have promiſed that, upon " the requiſition of the crown, they would grant their " voluntary ſubſidies?"

Admitting, that we could forget their conduct in the beginning of the laſt war, when they would ſcarce advance any thing to ſave themſelves, and when (if the *Marquis de Montcalm*, the French governor of *Canada*, may be credited) half of the moſt powerful Colonies might have been engaged by France in a neutrality; and admitting too, that theſe ſubſidies might be large and free, ſuch as " might ſeem meet and becoming " from great and flouriſhing Colonies" to their prince; could the policy of the moſt flagitious and ſubtle miniſter more fatally expoſe the liberties of the whole empire to diſſolution, than ſuch a conduct as this? A ſmall ſhare of addreſs in managing ſo many diſcordant intereſts, ſo many different legiſlatures, and

* *Penſylvanian Inſtructions in* Dickenſon's *Eſſay*, p. 24.

ſo

ſo many unaccountable ſubſides, might ſet one part againſt another, and finally ſubjugate the whole. An enemy might preſcribe the rule, *divide & impera*; but none, ſurely, but madmen, could propoſe it for themſelves. For, as a very ingenious foreigner hath obſerved, and lays it down as an incontrovertible maxim in politics, "A ſovereign who depends, with regard "to ſupplies, on *ſeveral* aſſemblies, in fact depends "upon none."—"Nothing therefore (adds he) could "be more fatal to Engliſh liberty, and to American "liberty in the iſſue, than the adoption of the idea, "cheriſhed by the Americans, of having independent "aſſemblies of their own, who ſhould treat immediately with the king, and grant him ſubſidies, to "the utter annihilation of the power of thoſe antient, "and hitherto ſucceſsful, aſſertors of general liberty, "the Britiſh Parliament."* So much is it the intereſt of the whole empire, that the money, voted to the crown, ſhould paſs through the hands and be ſubject to the controul of the Britiſh Commons, that, as the ſame judicious writer obſerves elegantly in another place, "the fineſt government upon earth was in dan"ger of total deſtruction, when *Bartholomew Columbus* "was on his paſſage to *England*, to teach *Henry* the ſeventh the way to *Mexico* and *Peru*."†

3. THE Americans, then, have demoliſhed the government, delegated to them from their parent-ſtate, and have renounced the operation of the one and ſuperiority of the other, in order to ſet up, what was the *third* charge againſt them, an independent, arbitrary, democratical government of their own; which, ſo far as it hath proceeded, hath deſtroyed all Britiſh conſtitutional liberty, and aims to deſtroy (which God forbid) the whole.

* De Lolme's Conſtitution of Englaud, p. 52.
† Ibid. p. 423.

I need

I need not deſcend to particular facts, which muſt be as freſh upon every man's memory here, as they are indelible from the memories of thoſe who have ſuffered abroad, to prove the *tyranny* of that violent and republican ſpirit, which now prevails in the Colonies. It will be ſufficient if, omitting the detail of this melancholy buſineſs which will merit a different inveſtigation, I take the ſum of what has already occurred, to the confuſion of all order, and to the diſgrace of humanity itſelf.

The Americans, as one of the firſt acts of their joint enmity to the authority of the King and the Britiſh Parliament, that only palladium of true liberty to Britons, interdicted the Britiſh commerce, upon pains and penalties, inflicted by no law, and ſpecified by no meaſure. So far from wiſhing the ſanctions of law and juſtice, they have ſhut up their courts of law to every claim of the Britiſh merchants, whoſe credulity, unſuſpicious of ſuch enormous diſhoneſty in perſons who make the loudeſt pretences to urbanity and religion, had entruſted them with their property, and ſupported them in their trade. So conſummate a fraud, by ſo large a body of men, was never tranſacted by a combination of Turks. A Turk would deem himſelf inſulted to be compared with Chriſtians like theſe. The very Arabs would ſcorn ſo vile and ſo mean a breach of confidence, and, with no pretences of piety, would deteſt a conduct ſo glaringly impious. The property, not only of the inhabitants of Britain, but of the reſidents of America, has been ſeized by lawleſs committees, merely on account of a difference in opinion, or the ſuſpicion of a difference. Perſons, who have tranſgreſſed no law, have been ſtigmatized and held up as public enemies for aſſaſſination or ruin, only for refuſing obedience to the arbitrary dictates of an audacious committee or an impudent mob. Houſes, the caſtles of Engliſhmen, have

have been violently forced and ſearched for the ſeizure of what any man has a right to keep, when the law has forbidden it to none. The very food and apparel of people have been preſcribed, not from the plea of a phyſical regimen, but from the illegal determination of an illegal aſſembly of men, who, ſcarce qualified to be ſervants, have dubbed themſelves maſters of an empire. Out of ſheer liberty, people are obliged to eat, drink, and wear nothing as they pleaſe. And, as if it were not ſufficient to *force* peeople againſt the laws, the arbitrary Republicans have combind to *cheat* them out of their property. For they have voted a paper-currency, upon their own faith *(græca fides!)* as a legal tender, which, when it has anſwered the vile and inſidious purpoſe of getting treaſure and property out of the hands of the holders, will not, and cannot, be worth, in the ſum of things, one ſingle farthing to the poſſeſſors. No perſons dare to refuſe this paper, through fear of arbitrary puniſhment, and of expoſing themſelves, their families and their all, to the mercy of a furious and ungovernable multitude. And thus they have begun a ruinous war, in which they have ſtaked, both voluntarily and involuntarily, all the wealth and peace of America, againſt the power and opulence of Great Britain. Nor is there any chance of eſcaping from ruin by this manœuvre, but by ruining their only prop and ſtay, Great Britain; and not even then, for their treaſure will be expended, their commerce deſtroyed, and every means of wealth exterminated, in the very deciſion of the conteſt. This idea, very able perſons among themſelves, who cannot be ſuſpected, and whom they do not ſuſpect, to have any ſeperate attachment or predilection for Britain, have ſtated again and again. Such men were too wiſe for their firſt Congreſs, and were therefore omitted in the ſecond. And ſo anxious

have

have their incendiaries been to bring matters to this tremendous criſis, that they have not ſuffered them to hold out one conciliatory propoſition, but in ſuch a way and of ſuch a kind, as offered inſult to the patience and dignity of the ſtate. To crown all their ſavage enormities, the *perſons*, as well as the properties, of innocent individuals, muſt, willing or unwilling, be committed in rebellion: for they have forced huſbands from their wives and children, and ſons from their parents, under the penalty of a goal and the moſt dangerous ſeverities, into an army, whoſe leaders are compoſed either of ungrateful and ambitious deſerters, or of ignorant and deſpicable leaders. In ſhort, no ſeverity has been ſpared to intimidate or compel the loyal ſubject, againſt his will, his intereſt, and his duty: no cruelty has been omitted, which ſavages would omit, upon thoſe, who have oppoſed their violent proceedings, and have had the misfortune afterwards to fall into their hands. Thus are the *Americans* arrived to the full developement of Mr. *Locke*'s great "myſtery (as he terms it) "in politics"——"A government with-"out laws, inconceivable to human capacity, and in-"conſiſtent with human ſociety."

This is a true repreſentation, and no exaggerated deſcription or carricature, of the proceedings of the arch-rebels, who have had the effrontery to ſtyle that part of the Britiſh dominions, THE TWELVE UNITED PROVINCES OF NORTH AMERICA, thereby erecting themſelves, or meaning to erect themſelves, either into a ſovereign independent ſtate, or, which is more likely into ſeveral diſtinct and independent democracies.*

Of

* One of the American writers, an agent to the republican faction at Boſton deputed to New York a few years ſince, pleaſed with the progreſs of his countrymen towards the ſtate of independency, vented the effuſions of his patriotiſm in this rhapſodical apoſtrophe: "Cou-"rage, Americans:—The finger of God points out a *mighty empire*

"to

Of the liberty to be enjoyed under theſe rebellious demagogues, we have an admirable ſample before us: and I would

" to your ſons!—We need not be diſcouraged—The angry cloud will " ſoon be diſperſed—The *day dawns*, in which the foundation of this " mighty empire is to be laid, *by the eſtabliſhment of a regular American* " *conſtitution*. All that has hitherto been done, ſeems to be little be- " ſide the *collection of materials* for the *conſtitution of this glorious fabric*. " 'Tis time to put them together. The transfer of the European part " of the family is ſo vaſt, and our growth ſo ſwift, that, *before ſe-* " *ven years roll over our heads*, the firſt ſtone muſt be laid.—Peace " or war; famine or plenty; poverty or affluence; in a word, no cir- " cumſtance, whether proſperous or adverſe, can happen to our parent; " nay, no conduct of her's, whether wiſe or imprudent; no poſſible " temper on her part, whether *kind* or *croſs-grained*, will put a ſtop " to this *building*." So long have the republican architects drawn the plan of this glorious pile! So long have they waited to celebrate the jubilee of independence! And ſo long have theſe worthies (to uſe the phraſe of their old fried *Hudibras*)

——— " Felt ſuch bowel-bankerings
" To ſee an empire *all of Kings*;
" Deliver'd from th' Egyptian awe
" Of juſtice, government and law!"

Formerly it did not ſuit the deſigns of theſe men openly to avow their principles; but now they declare them without a maſk. Mr. *Samuel Adams*, one of the leaders of the congreſs, ſo heartily imbibes the notion of a ſeparation from the Britiſh empire, that he entitles his pamphlet, written *ex profeſſo* to inculcate it, by the name of COMMON SENSE; as though it were folly to doubt of it for a moment. I am obliged, for the following extracts from this *patriotic* performance to a writer under the ſignature of *Coriolanus* in the Public Advertiſer of April 8th, 1776. Their chief merit conſiſts in the removal of all ambiguity.

" I am inclined to believe (ſays Mr. *Adams*) that all thoſe who " eſpouſe the doctrine of *reconciliation* may be included within the fol- " lowing deſcription. Intereſted men, who are not to be truſted; " weak men, who cannot ſee; prejudiced men, who *will* not ſee; " and a ſet of moderate men who think *better* of the European world " than it deſerves.

" Europe is too thickly planted with kingdoms to be long at peace; " and whenever a war breaks out between England and any foreign " power, the trade of America goes to ruin—becauſe of her con- " nection with Great Britain. The next war may may not turn " out like the laſt, and ſhould it not, the advocates for reconciliation " *now* will be wiſhing for ſeparation *then*, becauſe neutrality in that " caſe would be a ſafer convoy than a man of war. Every thing " that is right and reaſonable pleads for a ſeparation." P. 38.

" I am not induced by motives of pride, party or reſentment to " eſpouſe the doctrine of *independence* and *ſeparation*—I am clearly, " poſitively and conſcientiouſly perſuaded that it is the true intereſt

" of

I would aſk any diſpaſſionate man, who loves the reality more than the mere name of liberty, whether any thing

" of this country to be ſo; that every thing *ſhort of that* is mere " patch-work; that it can afford no laſting felicity; that it is leaving the ſword to our children, and ſhrinking back, when a LITTLE MORE, A LITTLE FARTHER, would have rendered this " continent the glory of the earth." P. 45.

" 'Tis ſaid the king has a negative on acts of the Engliſh legiſlature, " and therefore ought to have it on ours; but to this I only ſay, " that England being the king's reſidence and America not ſo, makes " quite another caſe. The king's negative here is ten times more " dangerous and fatal than it can be in England; for there he will " ſcarcely refuſe his aſſent to a bill for putting England into as " ſtrong a ſtate of defence as poſſible, and here he would never ſuffer ſuch a bill to be paſſed." P. 49.

" Reconciliation is a dangerous doctrine. I affirm that it would " be policy in the king, at this time, to repeal the acts, for reinſtating himſelf in the government of the provinces, in order that he " may accompliſh by craft and ſubtlety, in the long run, what " he cannot do by force and violence in the ſhort one. Reconciliation and ruin are nearly related." P. 50.

" I challenge the warmeſt advocate for reconciliation to ſhew a " ſingle advantage that this Continent can reap by being connected " with Great Britain. I repeat the challenge; not a ſingle advantage is derived. Our corn will fetch its price in any market in " Europe, and our imported goods muſt be paid for, buy them " where we will. But the injuries and diſadvantages that we ſuſtain " by that connection are without number, and our duty to mankind at large, as well as to ourſelves, inſtructs us to renounce the " alliance; becauſe any ſubmiſſion to our dependence on Great Britain tends directly to involve this Continent in European wars and " quarrels. As Europe is our market for trade, we ought not " to form a political connection with any part of it. 'Tis the true " intereſt of America to ſteer clear of European connections, which " ſhe never can do, while, by her dependence on Britain, ſhe is made " the make-weight in the ſcale of Britiſh politics.

" 'Tis repugnant to reaſon, to the univerſal order of things, to " all examples from former ages, to ſuppoſe that this Continent can " long remain ſubject to any external power. The moſt ſanguine " in Britain do not think ſo. The utmoſt ſtretch of human wiſdom " cannot at this time compaſs a plan, ſhort of ſeparation, which can " promiſe the Continent even a year's ſecurity." P, 42.

" As to government matters,' tis not in the power of Britain to " do this Continent juſtice—the buſineſs of it will be ſoon to weighty " to be managed with any tolerable degree of conveniency, by a " power ſo diſtant from us, and ſo very ignorant of us; *for if they* " *cannot conquer us*, they *cannot govern us*. To be always running " three or four thouſand miles with a tale or petition, waiting four " or five months for an anſwer; which, when obtained, requires five

" or

thing of this ſort is to be apprehended under our mild, auſpicious ſyſtem, either here or in America? A ſyſtem, in the management of which, as foreigners with amazement and admiration are compelled to own, that, " if " they look at the conduct of all public officers in Eng- " land, from the miniſter of ſtate, or the judge, down " to the loweſt officers of juſtice; they find a ſpirit of " forbearance and lenity prevailing in England among " all perſons in power, which cannot (they ſay) but " create the greateſt ſurprize in thoſe, who have viſited " other countries."* This lenity and forbearance none have experienced more than the Americans themſelves; and yet none have upbraided the government, with more harſh and loud appellations of tyranny and arbitrary rule than they. Could they but have experienced the difference of any one other government upon earth, they would be ready to ready to ſay of their countrymen, what all the world muſt ſay of them;

O nimium fortunati, bona ſi ſua nôrint!

Our conſtitution is obliged to foreigners for an eulogium, which they, who feel its bleſſings, ſhould have been the firſt to pay themſelves.

And can the oppugnation of Britiſh dominion be juſtified upon any principle or theory? Mr. *Locke*, an inconteſtable authority with the Americans, ſhall anſwer: " EVERY MAN (ſays this ſpeculatiſt), that hath any " poſſeſſions or enjoyment of ANY PART of the domi-

" or fix more to explain it in, will in a few years be looked on as " childiſhneſs and folly. There was a time when it was proper, " and there is a proper time for it to ceaſe." P. 45.

" A government of our own is *our natural right*; and when a man " ſeriouſly reflects on the precarioufneſs of human affairs, he will " become convinced, that it is infinitely wiſer and ſafer to form A " CONSTITUTION of our own, in a cool, deliberate manner, while " we have it in our power, than to truſt ſuch an intereſting event " to time and chance." P. 58.

* DE LOLME, page 443.

" nions

" nions of ANY GOVERNMENT, doth thereby give his " tacit conſent, and is as far forth obliged to obedi- " ence to the laws of that government, *during ſuch en-* " *joyment*, as any one under it; whether this his poſ- " ſeſſion be of land *to him and his heirs for ever*, or a " lodging only for a week; or whether it be barely tra- " velling freely on the highway; and, in effect, IT " REACHES AS FAR AS THE BEING OF ONE WITHIN " THE TERRITORIES OF THAT GOVERNMENT." And further: " It would be a direct contradiction for any " one to enter into ſociety with others, for the ſecur- " ing and regulating of property, and yet to ſuppoſe " *his land, whoſe property is to be regulated* by the laws " of the ſociety, ſhould be *exempt from the juriſdiction of* " *that government*, to which *he himſelf*, the proprietor " of the land, *is a ſubject:* By the ſame act, therefore, " whereby any one united his perſon, which was be- " fore free, to any common-wealth [or community], by " the ſame he *unites his poſſeſſions*, which were before " free, to it alſo; and they become, *both* of them, " PERSON and POSSESSION, ſubject to the government " and dominion of that common-wealth, as long as it " hath a being." Thus much for the meaſure of rule: Now for the right to reſiſt. The ſame gentleman, ſpeaking of the *reſiſtance* of the people againſt their governors, when they think themſelves aggrieved, adviſes, " Let not any think, this [right of reſiſtance] lays a " perpetual foundation for diſorder; for this [right] " operates not, till the inconvenience is ſo great that " the MAJORITY [meaning of the whole ſtate or em- " pire] feel it, and are weary of it, and find a neceſſity " to have it amended." But this is ſo far from being the caſe, that the great body of the empire cannot

perceive

perceive, that the Americans, which are but an inferior part, have felt any other inconveniencies, than what their own forwardneſs in impoſing rules of commerce, and their own haughtineſs in abuſing the common government, have brought upon them. Let them name the tax, or the impoſition, whoſe burden they cannot bear. So far from having been diſtreſſed, 'tis the proſperity of the Americans, which has occaſioned the intolerable elation of mind, and brought ruin and all the horrors of a civil war to their very doors. And ſo remote is it from the deſire of Britons to oppreſs, that let them but throw down the implements of war, and acknowledge their error; let them propoſe, in the language of their Noble friend, " a juſt and free aid in " ſuch honourable proportion, as may ſeem meet and " becoming from great and floriſhing Colonies towards " the parent-country," labouring under burdens taken up and ſuſtained greatly on their account; they would be received with gladneſs; they would be treated with every cordiality of brethren, and admitted to their uſual rank and conſideration in the empire. Let them not be deceived however in ſuppoſing, that this is a war carried on againſt *Adminiſtration* (as ſome of their curious correſpondents here, who wait the reward of their crimes, have aimed to perſuade them): for every man, who loves his country, and ſees but a little into the conſequences of diſmembering and dividing its legiſlature, will perceive that they fall under that definition of rebellion, which the author above referred to (often abuſed to the purpoſes of ſedition) has clearly given them in his treatiſe upon civil government. " Rebellion, ſays " he, being an oppoſition, not to PERSONS but AU- " THORITY, which is founded only in the conſtitutions " and laws of the government; thoſe, WHOEVER THEY

" BE,

" BE, who by force break through, and and by force " juſtify their violation of them, are truly and properly " REBELS." Had it been poſſible for Mr. *Locke* to have ſeen the preſent temper and conduct of the Americans, he could not have marked them with greater preciſion, than in the extract before us.

It appears then, upon the whole, that thoſe of the Americans, now in rebellion, are aiming to reduce the ſtrength and conſtitution of Great Britain, by impeding her commerce, denying her ſupremacy, and aboliſhing her civil officers of government among them: and alſo that they are endeavouring, with the baſeſt ingratitude to a parent from whom they derive all their conſequence, to ſtrip her by force of arms of a conſiderable part of her dominions, for which ſhe ſacrificed her blood and treaſure in a war, principally undertaken for their protection and ſecurity. It further appears, that all this is maintained againſt the cleareſt dictates of equity, duty and reaſon, which with one conſent, delivered by the pen of their favorite reaſoner, aſſert, that " as govern- " ment cannot be ſupported without great charge, 'tis " fit that EVERY ONE, who enjoys a ſhare of the PRO- " TECTION, ſhould pay, out of his eſtate, HIS PROPOR- " TION for the maintenance of it." But this *proportion* is more than they are deſired to pay. Leave has been given them, with the utmoſt liberality of ſentiment, to ſpecify their own ſums among themſelves; and government, rather than bear the imputation of harſhneſs upon its younger children, would accept any reaſonable acknowledgment of their duty, either by a ratio eſtabliſhed on the taxes of Britain, or otherwiſe as may ſuit them better, and ſtill impoſe the weight of the load upon thoſe elder ſhoulders, who have borne it ſo long (and without reſiſtance too) for the general good.

At

At all events, we Britons know for what we contend; but the Americans (excepting their republican demagogues) know not. We ſtand up only for our conſtitution, and to keep it from being ſplit into parts for an eaſy deſtruction by external foes. In doing this, we ſtrive for the only ſecurity which our liberties, can find upon earth: and it will be ſeen that, in this contention and in ſuch a cauſe, Britons are Britons ſtill; and that, as America has been the firſt to take up arms, Great Britain will be the laſt to lay them down. The rebels, on the other hand, are diſputing either for an eſtabliſhment of anarchy, or for the erection of weak disjointed ſtates, which, if the object could be obtained, muſt be one of the greateſt evils that could befall them. I mean not that the Americans in general have this deteſted ſcheme in view; but, 'tis now conceived, *who* among them have. Hungry adventurers, broken merchants, pettifogging lawyers, and ambitious leaders, are always ſuſpicious diſputants for liberty; eſpecially, as ſuch people ſtick at no means to accompliſh their ſelfiſh and deſperate ends. The conſtant wiſh of ſuch men reſembles the petition of the old highland chieftains, whoſe uſual fervent grace was, "*Lord! turn the world upſide down, that chriſtians may* "*make bread out of it!*" The plain Engliſh (ſays my author) of this pious requeſt is. that the world might become, for their benefit, a ſcene of rapine and confuſion*. In the ſame ſtrain of piety, the "pulpit, and "drum eccleſiaſtic," have reſounded the infamous alarm, and exhibited a ſtriking proof, how much a ſet of men, who pretend to inculcate the religion of peace, have

Laid out their ſpiritual gifts to further,
Their great deſigns of rage and murther;
And fancy that they have a miſſion
To preach the faith with ammunition.

* PENNANT's *Voyage to the* Hebrides.

Theſe

Theſe build the church and ſtate upon
The holy text of pike and gun;
Decide all controverſies by
Infallible artillery;
And prove their doctrine orthodox
By apoſtolic blows and knocks.

But the ſhipwrights and other tumults are quieted, foreigners are deaf, and the tranſmiſſion of falſehoods can deceive no more. There are ſome, who will thoroughly comprehend theſe hints: it will be happy for them, if ſuch proof be not accumulated, as to preclude all neceſſity of amendment. Conſtant additions cannot fail of filling up the meaſure of iniquity.

In the mean time, every true patriot, not the noiſy reſtleſs animal uſually miſcalled by that name will join hand and heart, ſo far as his influence extends, that neither the rebels themſelves, nor their inſtigators here, may triumph over the conſtitutional ſupremacy of his King and Country. Nothing could more evince the real patriotiſm and magnanimity of adminiſtration, than their voluntary expoſure of themſelves to the cenſure of the miſguided and miſinformed multitude, to the trouble of carrying on this diſagreeable conteſt, and to the anxiety which muſt naturally ariſe in the direction of all coercive meaſures; when, by giving up the fortreſs of our happy conſtitution to the clamor of the ignorant or ſeditious, they might have paſſed on with as much caſe and tranquillity, as the proſpect of an enervated dominion and a ſinking land could have afforded them. Their conduct, in this cauſe hitherto, deſerves the thanks of their country: a timid and conceding behaviour would have merited, in the ſum of things, its ſevereſt indignation.

THE END